

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,535	12/28/2001	Nigel J. Tolson	034942-268	9807	
7590 01/13/2005			EXAMINER		
Robert E Kreb	os	CHOW, CHARLES CHIANG			
Thelen Reid &	Priest LLP				
PO Box 640640	)	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Jose, CA 95164-0640			2685		
			DATE MAIL ED: 01/13/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		App	Application No. Applicant(s)		•			
		10/	040,535	TOLSON, NIGEL	TOLSON, NIGEL J.			
		Exa	miner	Art Unit				
_		Cha	arles Chow	2685				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE   - External after   - If the   - If NC   - Failu   Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC Insions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply with reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). ication. days, a reply within tory period will appl ll, by statute, cause	In no event, however, may a reply be the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for the application to become ABANDO	timely filed days will be considered time om the mailing date of this on NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <i>21 July 20</i>	004.					
,			on is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) 8-10 is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,11 and 12 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	ion Papers							
10)□	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objecti Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to the specific or t	a) accepted on to the drawine correction is	ng(s) be held in abeyance. Some required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	• •			
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some color None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
2)  Notic 3)  Inform	et(s)  See of References Cited (PTO-892)  See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO)  The mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO)  The No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	• •	O-152)			

## Detailed Action (Amendment received on 7/21/2004)

#### **Declaration**

- 1. Withdrawn the objection to declaration because inventor's petition is granted for no signature from inventor, 12/11/2002.
- 2. Withdrawn the objection to claim 3 for the "second passive twin-T section". Because it is defined in claim 2.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Murtojarvi (US 2002/0168,956 A1).

Regarding claim 6, Martojarvi teaches a method for processing multiple signal modes according to different radio standards of a received rf signal (GSM, EDGE modes in [0051, 0081]), comprising performing down conversion of the received rf signal to produce analog I and Q signals and for each of the analog I and Q signal, filtering out unwanted signals (down converted in pahse out, quadrature out, filters 8, 10 for I, Q, Fig. 5, [0055-0059]), for a first standard processing the analog signal (processing signal in GSM mode [0081-0082]) using a first passive notch filter (passive notch filter 10 in Fig. 7) to produce a first filtered signal (output from notch filter 10), and for a second standard processing the analog signal

(processing signal in EDGE mode [0081-0082]) using an active notch filter (active notch filter 10 in Fig. 8) to produce a second filtered signal (output from notch filter 10), wherein the active notch filter exhibits smaller group delay than the passive notch filter (the narrower band stop from active notch filter, providing fast signal transition, which provides less group delay than passive notch filter [0068]).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 7, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murtojarvi-'965 A1 in view of Thomasson (US 2002/0000,874 A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Murtojarvi teaches a filter circuit apparatus for suppression of spurious signal in a superheterodyne circuit for receiver communication channels (Fig. 5, [0055-0059] with channel filter 8), a first analog active twin-T filter in a first signal path (signal path for I, Fig. 5) defining a first sharp notch (the notch from active twin-T notch filter 10, Fig. 8, [0069]). The notch filter 10 can be any type of notch filter [0073], the notch at the center of a second adjacent channel (the notch filter 10 to attenuate tail bit frequencies [0062], for the second adjacent channel). Murtojarvi teaches notch twin T filter 10 (Fig. 5, Fig. 7) can be either passive twin T filter (Fig. 7) or active Twin T filter (Fig. 8). Murtojarvi fails to teach the two twin T notch filters in series, such that the analog passive twin T filter coupled to receive output of the analog active twin-T filter

defining a second sharp notch. However, Thomasson teaches the cascaded notch filters with defined two notch frequencies (Fig. 6) from the cascaded notch filters 43, 44 in any order (abstract, Fig. 4-5, [0028-0031]), and the cascaded twin T filters can contain at least one active twin-T filter (Thomasson's claim 2). Thomasson teaches the analog inexpensive band pass filter with improved group delay [0012-0015]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Murtojarvi's twin-T with Thomasson's cascaded active, passive twin-T filters, such that the filter could further attenuate the different spurious signal with improved group delay. Regarding claim 2, Murtojarvi teaches the superheterodyne circuit employs an in phase and a quadrature phase signal path (4, I, Q paths in Fig. 5), the first signal path corresponding to the in-phase signal (path from 4 to 12). Thomasson teaches at least one active twin T notch filters is in series with a second notch twin T filter, to replace Murtojarvi's notch filter 10 (Thomasson's claim 2 and Murtojarvi's any type of notch filters [0073]), for the quadrature phase signal path. Murtojarvi teaches the notch filter 10 for the first notch at center of the second adjacent channel to notch out tail bit frequencies, and Thomasson teaches the cascaded twin T filter having two notch frequencies, for the claimed second notch at the center of a next adjacent channel to suppress spurious signals at frequencies of modulation product.

Regarding claim 7, Murtojarvi teaches the twin-T notch filter 10 for the second standard EDGE, and notch filter 10 can be any type of notch filters. Murtojarvi fails to teach the second passive notch filter to produce a third filtered signal. However Thomasson teaches

Application/Control Number: 10/040,535

Art Unit: 2685

these features, the cascaded second notch filters 44, 43 (Fig. 4-5). Thomasson teaches the analog inexpensive band pass filter with improved group delay [0012-0015]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Murtojarvi's twin-T with Thomasson's cascaded active, passive twin-T filters, such that the filter could further attenuate the different spurious signal.

Regarding claim 11, Murtojarvi teaches a filter apparatus comprising active twin-T filter (Fig. 5, Fig. 8), the active twin-T filter is operable to filter communications signal associated with the first wireless communication standard [0062-0063, 0082]. Murtojarvi fails to teach the passive notch filter network coupled to the active twin-T filter.

However, Thomasson teaches these features, the cascaded notch filters with defined two sharp notches in Fig. 6 from the cascaded notch filters 43, 44 in any order (abstract, Fig. 4-5, [0028-0031]), with the at least one active twin-T filter in the cascaded filters (Thomasson's claim 2). Thomasson teaches the analog inexpensive band pass filter with improved group delay [0012-0015]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Regarding claim 12, Murtojarvi teaches the passive notch filter network (Fig. 7) is operable to filter communication signals associated with a second wireless communication standard (the notch filter 10 in Fig. 5, for filtering signal of a second wireless communication EDGE standard, the filtering of the EDGE tail bit [0082], the filter 10 for attenuating tail bit [0062-0063]).

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Murtojarvi's twin-T with

Thomasson's cascaded active, passive twin-T filters, such that the filter could further

attenuate the different spurious signal with improved group delay.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murtojarvi'965A1 in view of Thomasson, and further in view of Anderson (US 3,579,135).

Regarding claim 5, Murtojavi and Thomasson do not teach the active bootstrap

configuration, topology, of the active twin-T filter. Anderson teaches a twin-t notch filter

(Fig. 1-6, abstract, col. 1, lines 5-53). Anderson teaches the active bootstrapping topology

configuration of the active twin-T filter, to sharpen up the filtering response curve (col. 4,

line 5-20). Anderson teaches the improved stable active notch filtering network as shown

in Fig. 2, with accuracy and efficiency for without tuning, for rejecting adjacent

frequencies (col. 1, lines 11-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Murtojarvi, Thomasson with

Anderson's active bootstrapping twin-T filter, such that the active notch filter could

accurately reject the adjacent frequencies.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 8-10 are allowable over the prior art of record, the prior art fails to teach singly, particularly, or in combination, the subject matter, for the claimed features for the first passive and first active twin-T filters coupled to the in-phase output of the demodulator, and the second passive and active twin-T filters coupled to the quadrature-phase output of the demodulator (claim 8). The dependent claims are also allowable due to their dependency upon the independent claims.

The closest patent to Murtojarvi (US 2002/0168,956 A1) teaches the twin-T filter 10 (Fig. 5, Fig. 7-8 for each of the I, Q signal demodulation path. Murtojarvi fails to teach the <u>first</u> passive and first active twin-T filters coupled to the in-phase output of the demodulator, and the second passive and active twin-T filters coupled to the quadrature-phase output of the demodulator.

Other prior arts in below has been considered, but they fail to teach the above claimed features.

Thomasson (US 2002/0000,874 A1) teaches the cascaded active notch filter followed by passive notch filter in any order. Thomasson fails to teach the <u>first passive and first active</u> twin-T filters coupled to the in-phase output of the demodulator, and the second passive and active twin-T filters coupled to the quadrature-phase output of the demodulator.

West (US 3,577,179) teaches cascaded active twin-T filter for adjacent, next adjacent spurious signal suppression. West fails to teach the <u>first passive and first active twin-T filters</u> coupled to the in-phase output of the demodulator, and the second passive and active twin-T filters coupled to the quadrature-phase output of the demodulator.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### Claims Objection

7. Claims 3-4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach the different feed in each one of the first and second signal path having cascaded third, fourth active, passive, twin-T filter pairs having cross coupled feature.

#### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding applicant's amendment for the MPEP 2143.01 for the non-combinable Jayaraman to West due to the combining would change the principle of operation and produce unsatisfactory result, by combining West analog twin-T filters to Jayaraman's digital coefficient filter 240, the ground of rejection has been changed by utilizing Murtojarvi (US 2002/0168,956 A1) and Thomasson (US 2002/0000,874 A1).

Murtojarvi teaches in Fig. 5 the quadrature down conversion with switchable notch filter 10 for I, Q path respectively for two communication standards GSM and EDGE. The notch filter 10 can be any type of notch filter [0073]. Thomasson teaches the cascaded notch filters can be in any order (abstract, Fig. 4-5) with at least on active twin-T filter in the cascaded configuration (Thomasson's claim 2).

#### Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Chow whose telephone number is (703)-306-5615.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Edward Urban, can be reached at (703)-305-4385.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

### Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 220 South 20th Street, Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03, Arlington, VA 22202 (Customer Window).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Charles Chow C.C

January 10, 2005.

EDWARD F. URBAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000